



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

history of the department. In the latter part of the book, moreover, devoted to the actual organization and functions of the department, one finds included indiscriminately in a single chapter such unrelated subjects as the making of treaties, extradition, classification of correspondence, and the distribution of official duties. All such data would have been of much greater value if they had been arranged in the form of a manual for general reference, provided with numbered sections and a full index of the nature of a digest.

In spite of these criticisms the book has a decided value; first of all to historians and students of government; secondly, to all categories of officials whether within or without the Department of State; and thirdly, to the general public who may desire at any moment to ascertain the precise functions of that branch of the government, or to know the exact procedure to be followed in a given instance. The chapters on the Diplomatic and Consular Service, and on Passports and Authentications are of especial value, furnishing as they do authoritative data in the form of rules and regulations not easily to be found elsewhere. It is apparent however that such data are merely of temporary value as they are liable to be superseded at any time by fresh rules and regulations or by acts of Congress reorganizing the diplomatic and consular services.

The author announces his purpose in the preface "to show the formation and development of the Department of State and what its chief duties are and have been". His concern "has been with the machine of which the foreign service is a part and whose movements the Secretary of State directs". He has reasonably adhered to this purpose and may well rest satisfied with the thoroughness and accuracy with which he has fulfilled his task. A fairly complete index renders the book serviceable for needed reference within the limits indicated.

PHILIP MARSHALL BROWN.

*Letters and Papers of John Singleton Copley and Henry Pelham, 1739-1776.* [Massachusetts Historical Society, Collections, vol. LXXI.] (Boston: The Massachusetts Historical Society, 1914. Pp. xxii, 384.)

THIS notable collection of letters, which may be said to have been pulled out of the fire, for no one knows how or why these harmless private papers of two humble provincials ever got into the Public Record Office in London, is one of the most important of the many issues from the press of the venerable Massachusetts Historical Society, possessing as it does not only general historical interest but a very valuable material side not usual with such publications. It fixes points of great consequence that hitherto have been vexed and disputed as to the places where Copley painted and the authorship of many valuable portraits. The most significant of these disputed questions is as to whether Copley vis-

ited the Southern colonies, as has been claimed, and painted portraits there. The letters here printed negative the proposition in such a convincing way as to make it affirmatively certain that he did not. From this, numbers of Southern portraits attributed to Copley are forced to seek other paternity. Copley's only journey from Boston was in June, 1771, to New York, where he remained until the end of the year, and in these six months he painted thirty-seven portraits. He made one excursion from New York, going to Philadelphia (p. 163) Thursday, September 19, and reaching there Saturday *evening*, the 21st. To return he left Philadelphia Thursday *morning*, September 26, and got back to New York on Sunday, the 29th. I am particular in noting these dates in order to warn against the frequent looseness of statement in general correspondence that is not only confusing but what is more serious, misleading. For instance, in a letter from Copley to his brother Pelham, of November 6 (p. 174), in mentioning the amount of work he had done in New York, he speaks of "going to Philadelphia which took up 2 Weeks"; when we have seen he was away only ten days and in Philadelphia but four full ones. The importance of this is, that as all of his time was occupied socially and in studying the collections of paintings of Governor John Penn and of Messrs. Hamilton and Allen, he did not have time, in the four days he was there, to paint any portraits, as it has often been stated he did. And this brings me to an error in the note on page 301, where Copley mentions "Mr. Mifflins portrait and his Ladys". A note says, "Samuel and Rebecca Edgel Mifflin". The painting referred to by Copley was of Thomas Mifflin, afterward governor of Pennsylvania, and his wife Sarah Morris, now in the collection of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania; the portraits of "Samuel and Rebecca Edgel Mifflin", attributed to Copley, were painted by Charles Willson Peale.

According to Allan Cunningham, presumably on the authority of Copley's son Lord Lyndhurst, the painter was born July 3, 1737, and this date has been followed in most of his biographies. But in a letter printed on page 48, dated September 12, 1766, Copley speaks of himself as of "the age of twenty-eight", to which there is a note, "This would show that he was born in 1738, and not in 1737, as usually stated. The Boston Records contain no entry of his birth or baptism." Consequently he was about ten years old when his half-brother Henry Pelham was born, February 14, 1748/9, and from Peter Pelham, who married Copley's mother, they must have both learned the rudimentary principles of painting, but knowing, as we do, the elder Pelham's meagre ability we know that he was but a broken reed to lean upon. Such being the case, the highly meritorious works that Copley produced in this country are all the more "wonderful", to use the adjective Sir Joshua Reynolds applied to "The Boy and Squirrel" (p. 41), when it was shown in London. It was plainly the self-development of his artistic consciousness that enabled him to paint the great portraits that he did before he

ever had been under foreign influence; indeed it was his feeling that his American paintings were his best works and a critical survey of his pictures painted here, before 1774, when he crossed the ocean, and his canvasses painted in Europe up to his death in 1815, show that his own estimate was the correct one.

The letters forming the latter half of the volume, from and to Copley and Pelham, many of them after Copley left Boston, are of extreme interest but my limits preclude me from more than mentioning them. It seems needless to say that typographically the book is all that the most fastidious can desire, and that the editorial work is of the first order, the letters having been printed with Chinese regard to exactness in orthography and expression. The only weak point is the index, which is sparse and wholly inadequate to point out the nuggets hidden in the text.

CHARLES HENRY HART.

*The Letters of Richard Henry Lee.* Collected and edited by JAMES CURTIS BALLAGH, Ph. D., LL.D., Associate Professor of Political Science in the University of Pennsylvania. [Published under the auspices of the National Society of the Colonial Dames of America.] Volume II., 1779-1794. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1914. Pp. xxiii, 608.)

THIS second volume of Richard Henry Lee's letters, ably edited as was the earlier volume, does nothing to raise our estimation of him as a statesman. A very active political busybody, as he always proved himself, was sure to attain a certain lower middle-class reputation, somewhat enhanced in the popular mind because a favoring star made him the proposer of the resolution for Independence. These letters of the last fifteen years of his life, some 290 in number, reveal his views as a member, and one time president, of Congress, a Virginia legislator, and a senator from that state. Vain of his broad and statesmanlike mind, he was really narrow and sectional in a marked degree. His section, his state, his family were ever his chief concern.

The first 150 pages of these letters are almost wholly concerned with attacks on Silas Deane, whose published *Defense* against the charge of Arthur Lee, was denounced by Richard Henry Lee as an "infamous libel both against Congress and our family". He finds Deane "the most false and wicked Libeller that ever disgraced human nature", and accepts Arthur Lee's epithets, "Turbidus, inquietus, atrox", "his character too much of the Catilinarian cast". Lee's letters reveal in an amusing way the rising temperature of his wrath, as when he says that Deane hurt the United States more than 20,000 men, and a little later raises his estimate to 30,000 men, only to amend this with 40,000 men. We begin to look for eleven men in buckram. Lee hated Franklin because he had defended Deane. To Arthur Lee he writes hoping for